PATTERNS OF POWER

The Machine That Runs Itself

A Foundational Statement of How the Few Govern the Many

Thomas J. Bryan
with Claude (Anthropic)

PATTERNS OF POWER · 2026

A Note on Method and Intent

> *This is the foundational statement of the whole body of work, written to be read cold and to make every other paper in the collection legible as an elaboration of one machine. It takes no partisan or theological position. Its claims are structural and functional: it describes how the arrangement tends to work, not whether any particular belief inside it is true and not whether the arrangement is good. The reader is asked to hold the stance the entire collection keeps, which is the careful separation of two questions usually run together — the question of how a thing operates from the question of whether it ought to.*
>
> *Two cautions about the kind of claim being made. The first is that this is an argument in the language of tendency, not of law. The pattern it describes is a strong and recurring tendency with real exceptions, not a mechanism that fires on rails; where the scholarship it draws on is contested, it says so, because a pattern stated honestly as a tendency is more useful than a law that the next case breaks. The second is that the people in this account, rulers and ruled alike, were acting on real beliefs and real interests as they understood them. No one in this account is a fool, and no one is a conspirator. They are human beings in situations, doing what their situations made sensible. That is the whole of the method, and it is enough to explain a great deal.*
>
> *A note on the collaboration. The framework in these pages is Thomas J. Bryan's: the governing insight that durable rule rests on managed belief over a floor of force; that people decide by weighing expected benefit against expected cost, with benefit set by what they were formed to value and cost real only where someone is held to account; and that arrangements endure because they set both of those dials in their own favor. The research, the reconstruction, and the writing are the work of Claude (Anthropic), directed throughout by that framework. Neither half would be what it is without the other.*

I. The Question

The oldest and most stubborn fact about large human societies is that a few people consume a disproportionate share of what the many produce, and that the arrangement persists across centuries — through famine and plague and war and the turnover of every individual who ever lived inside it — far more stably than the numbers of the few or the resources of the many would lead anyone to predict. A village of a few hundred can be ruled by a handful. An empire of millions can be ruled by a class that would fit in a single hall. The many vastly outnumber the few, vastly outweigh them in muscle and hands and need, and could in principle sweep them away in an afternoon. They almost never do. The arrangement holds.

This is the question the collection exists to answer, and the two most common answers are wrong in the same way. The romantic answer says the many are kept down by force and ignorance and will rise when the force lifts or the ignorance clears. The cynical answer says the many are duped by a

clever ruling class that manufactures their consent. Both picture an external thing — the soldier, the lie — pressing on a population that would, if the pressure were removed, spring back into some other and freer shape. The answer this collection arrives at, across many civilizations and many centuries, is that there is usually no such external thing pressing on a population that would otherwise spring back, because the holding is mostly not external. It is internal. In the durable cases the arrangement is held up by the very people it governs, acting on their own real beliefs and their own real interests, with the ruling class needing to apply direct force only at the margins. The machine, once built, tends to run itself.

The word *tends* is load-bearing and will recur. The arrangement is not a law of nature. It fails; it is overturned; it is escaped at the edges and occasionally in the center. People do see through it, and walk away from it, and tear pieces of it down. What the collection claims is not that the machine cannot be broken but that it is unusually durable — that it reproduces itself cheaply, recovers from shocks, and outlasts the individuals who staff it — and that the source of that durability is not the soldier at the gate but the structure of how the governed decide. To understand power is to understand how a machine of that kind gets built, why it runs without anyone cranking it, and what the few at its center actually contribute, which is less than they imagine and different from what the official story says.

The statement that follows builds the answer around a single mechanism, the way an ordinary person decides what to do, and then shows how two facts that no one chose allow that mechanism to be set, over time, in the rulers' favor — and how the same two facts, read the other way, explain why the setting can also come loose.

II. The Mechanism: Cost, Benefit, and the Two Dials

Begin with the engine, because everything else in this account is a description of how the engine gets set. People do what they expect will benefit them, weighed against what they expect it will cost them. That is the whole of it. It is ordinary cost and benefit, the common sense of how a person weighs a choice, and stated baldly it explains nothing, because everyone runs it and yet people in the same situation often decide alike while people in different situations decide differently. What turns a truism into an instrument is the recognition that two things must be set before the engine can run, that neither is given by nature, and that they are exactly the two things a governing arrangement learns to set.

The first thing that must be set is what the person counts as a benefit — and this is the deeper of the two, the one most easily missed. To know what will benefit a person, you have to know what they value, and what a person values is not read off the world; it is installed in them, mostly early, mostly by others, before they were in any position to weigh it. The man formed inside a faith does not experience the obligations of that faith as costs to be set against his other interests. Being faithful is itself among the highest benefits his value system contains, because his formation put it there. Ask him to betray it for money and you are not offering him a better deal; you are offering him a loss, and

he will refuse the way a person refuses to sell something sacred. His benefit column was filled in for him. He is reasoning correctly from values that were placed in him before he could question them. This is the first dial, and it is the one the collection cares about most, because whoever fills a person's benefit column has already won most of the argument without ever having to make it.

The second thing that must be set is whether a cost is real, and here the mechanism is blunter. A cost is only a cost when someone is held accountable to it — when there is, in fact, something present and able to impose the penalty. A cost that will not be imposed is not a cost; it is a bluff, and people read the difference, often without knowing they are reading it. The law restrains the man on the street while he expects to be caught and stops restraining the same man, with the same values, the moment the watcher is gone, because the penalty fell out of his arithmetic. Accountability is not the existence of a rule. It is the live presence of an enforcer the person believes can and will act. This is the second dial: how much of the cost column is real because someone is keeping account, and how much is empty because no one is.

So the engine is one fixed thing with two dials. The first dial, set by formation, fills the benefit side with the person's installed values. The second dial, set by the presence or absence of a credible accounting, fills the cost side with real or merely nominal penalties. Read both dials for a person in a moment, and the engine tells you, in tendency, what they will do. This is what the collection means by *position logic*: a person acts on the costs and benefits visible from their own position, so that people in like positions tend to decide alike without any coordination, and the aggregate of many separate individual calculations can look, from outside, like a class acting with one mind when in truth there is no collective mind at all — only many people in similar positions running the same arithmetic on similar dials. The engine needs no conspiracy and no class consciousness. It needs only individuals, their installed values, and their reading of whether deviation will actually cost them.

Everything that follows is about those two dials: why the population cannot simply walk away from whoever sets them, why the human mind allows the first dial to be set at all, how an arrangement turns from setting only the second dial to setting the first, who maintains the setting, and why the setting is durable without being permanent.

III. The Floor: Why Leaving Is Not an Option

The two dials would not matter if a person dissatisfied with how they were set could simply leave. The first foundational fact is that, in an advanced society, they mostly cannot — and the reason is physical, which is why the arrangement is better understood as a trap than as a contract.

The matter is clearest at the origin, though the origin is contested and worth stating carefully. The anthropologist Robert Carneiro argued that the earliest states arose where good farmland was hemmed in by desert, mountain, or sea, so that a population pressed against its limits could not simply disperse when a strongman began to coordinate and coerce it: where people could walk away they did, and no state formed, and where they were penned by geography they were available to be organized, taxed, and ruled. The argument is illuminating, and it is also disputed — there are densely

settled, environmentally hemmed-in places, the highlands of New Guinea the most cited, where on Carneiro's logic states should have formed and did not, and Carneiro himself later softened the claim to say that circumscription accelerated state formation rather than strictly causing it. The collection takes the prudent reading: physical circumscription is one strong route by which a population becomes capturable, not the only one and not a law. What matters for the argument is the general principle the disputes leave standing, that coordination becomes domination most easily where the coordinated cannot leave.

The historian James Scott added the detail that the early states were built on grain, and not by accident, because grain alone among the staples is visible, divisible, storable, and assessable — it ripens at a known time, above ground, all at once, so a tax collector can measure it and take a share. A state can run on wheat that stands in the field to be counted; it cannot easily run on tubers that hide in the ground and are dug as needed. The early states, on Scott's reading, were in part population machines: they gathered people onto the fertile land, set them to producing a surplus, and worked to keep them from fleeing, because the people were the asset.

What began under coercion became, over millennia, a dependence that needs no coercion to maintain, because the system that grew to coordinate the farming kept raising the number of people the land could feed, and the number rose to meet it. The single most concrete measure of how far is nitrogen. Every protein in every living body is built on it, and for the whole of history before the twentieth century the supply of usable nitrogen was the hard ceiling on how much food could be grown. The industrial fixation of nitrogen from the air, the Haber-Bosch process, broke that ceiling early in the twentieth century, and the population, which had hovered near one and a half billion, climbed past eight. Estimates converge, with honest disagreement at the edges about how much is cause and how much correlation, on the order of magnitude: something close to half the people now alive are fed only because of synthetic nitrogen, and a comparable fraction of the nitrogen in a living human body was fixed not by any natural process but in an industrial reactor. Even the skeptics who object that cheap food drove population rather than the reverse do not dispute the dependence that now exists; they dispute its history. The dependence is the point. The people are, in the most literal chemical sense, partly built out of the apparatus that feeds them.

This is the floor beneath the two dials, and the collection calls it the *metabolic trap*. The population's relation to the coordinating apparatus is metabolic: the apparatus is the metabolism that turns energy into people, and the people cannot survive its interruption any more than a body can survive the stopping of its own. The trap has a one-way door. Each increment of the apparatus let more people live, and those people became the population the next increment had to feed, so the number ratcheted up and cannot ratchet back down without the death of the difference. There is no returning to the small, genuinely freer world of foragers, because that world could feed a tiny fraction of the people now alive. The floor does not, by itself, say that a few must rule the many. It says the many must be coordinated by something, on pain of catastrophe, and a thing that must coordinate millions is a thing a few can capture and then set the dials of. The floor makes the room. What lets the dials be set inside it is the second fact.

IV. The Lock: Why the Value Dial Can Be Set

The second foundational fact is cognitive, and it is the reason coordination so reliably becomes domination rather than mere management: the human mind was assembled by evolution for a world that no longer exists, and several of the features that served it well in that world function, in the world the apparatus created, as points of entry through which the first dial can be set by someone other than the person himself.

For almost the whole of the species' existence, people lived in small bands, everyone known to everyone, status earned in front of witnesses over a lifetime, the group small enough that a defector could be remembered and a bully abandoned. The mind shaped for that world carries features that were precision instruments then and are openings now. People defer, fast and below conscious thought, to figures marked as authoritative — a sound rule when the authority was a known elder with a real record, a misfire when it fires on a stranger marked only by a uniform or a title. People bind hard to their in-group and signal belonging through conformity — insurance in a band where exile meant death, now fastened onto nations and parties and faiths at a scale that drains the original logic away. People convert certain commitments into sacred values felt to be beyond all trade-off — a mechanism that made tribal loyalties credible, now firing reliably on the flag, the text, the cause, whatever a person's formation placed there. People reason in stories before they reason in propositions, letting a narrative organize their sense of what is real before the deliberating mind is engaged to ask whether it is true. And people carry, from a childhood formation that installed their basic frameworks before they could evaluate anything, a sunk cost so large that by the time they could question what was installed, questioning it would mean unmaking the self that was built on it.

These five features are not weaknesses of foolish people. They are features of every human mind, the clever and the suspicious included, and the companion paper treats them at length under the name of *the exploit*. Two qualifications keep the claim honest. The first is that the framework these features rest on — the picture of a fast, automatic layer of cognition beneath a slow, deliberate one — is a useful and well-evidenced model, associated above all with Daniel Kahneman, but it is a model under live debate among psychologists, not a settled map of the brain, and the argument here needs only its uncontroversial core: that much of human response is fast, pre-reflective, and not under deliberate control in the moment. The second is that these features vary in strength across people and cultures and do not fire identically in everyone, which is part of why the machine is a tendency and not a law.

The single best-evidenced of the five, and the one the rest of the argument leans on, is the sacred-value mechanism. The psychologist Philip Tetlock and his colleagues have shown in the laboratory that people treat certain values as carrying, in effect, infinite significance — refusing even to compute trade-offs against them, and responding to the mere proposal of such a trade-off with moral outrage. The same line of research found something the collection's argument depends on: that the outrage carries with it not only condemnation of the violator but a drive to punish him, and to look down on anyone who shirks the duty of punishing. The sacred-value mechanism, in other words, comes with a built-in enforcement drive aimed at the violator and at the non-enforcer alike. Hold that

finding; it is the hinge on which the self-running machine turns, because it means the people who hold a value will, unprompted, do the costing for the arrangement — they will impose the penalties that the second dial requires, against each other, for free.

Connect the five back to the two dials and their role is exact. The narrative capture, the sacred-value lock, and the sunk cost of childhood formation are how the *first* dial gets set by someone other than the self: they are the means by which a person's benefit column is filled, early and below the threshold of evaluation, with the values the arrangement needs them to hold. The authority heuristic and the coalition-loyalty instinct chiefly serve the *second* dial: they let a mere symbol stand in for a real enforcer, so that an authorized figure is obeyed as though he carried force, and they make the social cost of visible deviation — exclusion from one's people — a penalty the person feels even when no official is watching. The floor said the many cannot leave. The lock says the dials of those who cannot leave can be set from outside. The rest is how an arrangement does the setting.

V. The Build: From the Sword to the Self-Running Machine

Now the pieces can be assembled into the thing they make: a governing arrangement that begins in naked force and tends, over generations, toward a population that governs itself on the rulers' behalf without being told to. The sequence recurs across civilizations that never touched, which is itself the sign that structure rather than borrowing produces it — though, as ever, it is a strong tendency with failures and detours, not a script.

It begins with the sword, because at the founding it must. A small coalition, bound by a shared interest in the new arrangement's success, takes power by force or its credible threat, because the previous holders will not step aside and the population has not yet been brought inside any framework that would make the new rule feel legitimate. At the founding the second dial is doing nearly all the work: compliance is coerced, the enforcer is everywhere, the arrangement is expensive and brittle, held only by the cost of defiance kept high at sword-point. This is the condition of the conqueror and the warlord, and on its own it does not last, because force exhausts itself, can be overmatched, and dies with the strongman. A coalition that stops here stays a warlord band, and the collection's papers on warlordism show what that looks like: power that must be continuously enforced, commands no loyalty beyond fear, and is swept away by the next stronger band.

The coalitions that endure do something else: they begin to work the first dial. They attach a belief — they tell a story that explains why their rule is right and not merely victorious, that the gods ordained it, that the blood is chosen, that the people themselves have consented — and they pitch the story to land on the features named above, installing it as narrative, as sacred, as the mark of belonging. The first generation, formed under the old world, mostly complies from fear and holds the story thinly. But the children of that generation are formed from birth inside the new story, before they can weigh it, and to them it is not a claim that was made and could be doubted; it is simply the shape of the world. Over a few generations the conversion tends to take, and the arrangement crosses the decisive line: it no longer rests mainly on the sword, because the population now values what the

arrangement rewards and finds it natural and right. The first dial has been turned up, and as it rose the second could be let down — the enforcer drawn back from all but the margins — because the people now comply from conviction rather than fear and would think less of themselves if they did not.

This is the self-running machine, and the term is meant precisely but not absolutely. When the governing story has been installed deeply and widely enough, compliance is no longer something the rulers must produce; it is produced by the governed, who measure their own conduct against the story's requirements, adjust it without instruction, and — here the Tetlock finding becomes the engine of the whole thing — apply pressure to those around them who deviate, shunning and reporting and punishing the violator and scorning whoever will not join the punishing. They experience none of this as serving the rulers. They experience it as decency, as defending what is sacred, as what a good person does. The rulers do not direct it, do not pay for it, and need not even know its details. The formation has outsourced the second dial to the formed: the people themselves keep the account and impose the costs. The arrangement's own direct force is now needed mainly against what the self-policing cannot reach — the organized faction, the rival storyteller, the community that was never brought inside the formation. Everything else runs, in the main, for free, powered by the genuine convictions of the people it governs.

VI. The Priesthood: Who Keeps the Values and Works the Reframing

A self-running machine of this kind has a part that is easy to overlook and that no durable version of it does without, because a story cannot interpret itself, and a population formed to revere a story still needs to be told what the story requires of it today. That part is the interpreter class, and it tends to emerge in every lasting arrangement, whatever the story's content.

The need is structural. The sacred text, the founding document, the revealed law — none speaks for itself to a new situation, and the population formed to hold it sacred is precisely the population least equipped to reinterpret it, because to them it is beyond question rather than open to analysis. So a class arises that claims the special knowledge needed to read the sacred thing correctly: the priests who alone may approach the god and pronounce his will, the scholars who alone have mastered the law, the judges and the learned who alone may say what the constitution means. They claim a knowledge the ordinary person lacks; the ordinary person defers, because the authority heuristic fires on their credentials and the sacred-value lock makes their domain untouchable; and they thereby gain the power to say what the sacred thing requires, which is the power to set the first dial's current reading and to say which deviations the second dial should punish. They are the keepers of the formation across the generations and the adjudicators of the cases the story did not foresee.

Here the sacred-value research supplies a second finding, the counterpart to the first and the reason the interpreter class is the seam of the whole structure. Tetlock found that while a forbidden trade-off named as a trade-off produces rigid outrage, a substantial minority of people will accept the

very same violation when it is rhetorically reframed as something else — as a tragic necessity, or an act of higher principle. The moral boundary, in his summary, turns out to be alternately punitively rigid and forgivingly flexible — rigid for whoever hears the rule raw, flexible for whoever controls the reframing. That flexibility is exactly the interpreter class's lever. The sacred rule binds the commoner absolutely, because he hears it raw; the priest, who controls the reframing, can find the reading that permits the powerful the exception the commoner is denied, presenting the exception not as a breach of the sacred rule but as its truer fulfillment. The rule the population enforces on itself with rigid outrage is, in the hands of its interpreters, supple. This is why the interpreter class is the place where the structure can be both maintained and contested: whoever can capture or split that class can change what the sacred thing is taken to require — can re-set the first dial for a whole population — without ever challenging its sacredness, which is among the deepest moves in the whole repertoire of power and the subject of much of the rest of the collection.

VII. A Worked Example: The Raised Stone

The whole machine can be seen firing at once in a single act, and the act the collection returns to as its clearest illustration is the stoning of a violator by the community under a sacred law. It is chosen not to single out any tradition — the structure is universal, and the same figure appears wherever societies have scaled — but because it shows every layer working together in one motion, and because the law in question was, like every such law, written by people.

Consider the layers as they meet in the raised stone. The sacred law was composed over time by people at or near the apex of the arrangement, and among its purposes was the securing of their position: to keep it is to uphold the order they sit atop, and to break it is to threaten that order. That is the loaded text, written in the language of the eternal because that was the only language that could bind. The law was then inherited, and the generations that received it did not experience it as the work of a faction but as the word of God, installed in them from childhood as sacred and beyond question. That is the first dial, turned: a written instrument of an old apex has become the deepest value of the people who live under it, so that upholding it now sits in their benefit column as a good in itself. The interpreter class stands ready to say which acts the law forbids and which persons have crossed its line, claiming the knowledge the crowd lacks and pronouncing the judgment the crowd accepts. That is the priesthood working the seam. And then the crowd takes up the stones, and the second dial fires through their own hands: the sacred-value mechanism makes the violation an outrage demanding punishment and carries, as the laboratory found, the drive to punish the violator and to scorn whoever holds back; the coalition instinct makes the violator an enemy of the group and the stoning a proof of one's own belonging; the authority heuristic makes the priest's judgment authoritative; and the long narrative capture has made the whole framework feel like reality rather than a claim that might be false.

Now read what has happened. A person who threatened the apex's order has been removed — but not by the apex, which lifted no hand and spent nothing. The threat was removed by the common

people, with their own hands, at their own initiative, experiencing the act not as service to the rulers but as righteousness, as the defense of the holy, as the thing a good member of the community does. The governed have enforced the governing order against one of their own, and felt virtuous doing it. The apex wrote the law generations ago and has done nothing since; the machine it built did the rest. This is the collection's argument compressed into one image: the loaded text written by the few, inherited as sacred by the many, kept by an interpreter class, and enforced — lethally and for free — by the very people it governs, whose enforcement of the few's order is experienced as their own deepest conviction. No conspiracy was needed and none occurred. No one was duped by a lie they would reject if they saw it, because the values the stone-thrower acts on are genuinely his own; his formation placed them in his benefit column, and from those values his reasoning is sound. The machine runs itself, and the hands that run it are the hands of the governed.

VIII. Why It Is Durable but Not Inescapable

The natural hope, at the end of an account like this, is that to see the machine is to be freed from it — that once a person understands how the dials were set, recognizes the loaded text for an old faction's instrument, and grasps that the sacred law was written by people for their own position, the setting comes loose and they walk free. The hope is mostly too quick, but the opposite conclusion, that seeing changes nothing and escape is impossible, is also wrong, and was overstated in the collection's earlier drafts. The truth is in between, and the two dials are what locate it.

What seeing the machine runs up against is not an iron law but the two dials, both of which the arrangement has set against the seeing. Take the first dial. A person's values were installed early, before they could weigh them, and the values are now genuinely theirs — the furniture of the self, the things they care about, the standards by which they judge what would even count as a better life. To "see through" the arrangement is not to flip a switch of fact; it is to call into question the contents of one's own benefit column, which is slow, effortful, disorienting work that requires getting informed, seeking out what the formation left out, and deliberately asking whether the way the world is presented is the way it has to be. Most people, most of the time, have neither the occasion nor the incentive nor the safety to undertake that work, not because they are incapable of it but because nothing in an ordinary life inside a working arrangement demands it, and a great deal discourages it. Now take the second dial. Even where the seeing begins, the arrangement attaches real costs to acting on it: the person still lives among people whose belonging runs on the shared belief, so visible deviation still carries the genuine penalty of exclusion, and where the sacred-value enforcement drive is strong the penalty for being seen to deviate can be severe and is imposed by neighbors, not by any official. Both dials, in other words, are set against escape — the benefit side skewed toward the arrangement by a formation the person did not choose, the cost side loaded against departure by an accounting their own community keeps. That is the real source of the machine's durability: not that it cannot be seen through, but that seeing through it is expensive on both dials at once, and the arrangement is what set both prices.

But expensive is not impossible, and this is where the earlier framing went wrong by treating the lock as total. People do see through it. People do change their values in adulthood — sometimes slowly, through study and exposure and the patient work of re-informing themselves; sometimes fast and wholesale, in the experience usually called conversion or, when it turns against the existing order, radicalization. The fact of conversion and radicalization is the standing proof that the first dial can be re-set after childhood, that formation is not destiny, that a benefit column filled by one arrangement can be emptied and filled again. And when enough people's dials come loose at once — when a shock discredits the story, or the interpreter class splits, or the costs of deviation fall because the enforcer weakens — the machine can fail in the center and not only at the margins, which is what the collection's historical papers trace in the rare cases of real upheaval.

Two honest qualifications keep this from sliding back into the romantic hope. The first is that re-setting the first dial almost never lands a person in some condition of value-free clarity, because there is no such condition; a benefit column cannot be empty and a self cannot be unformed. What conversion and radicalization most often do is exchange one set of installed values for another — to leave one arrangement's formation is, in the usual case, to enter another's, the convert and the radical now reasoning soundly from a new benefit column that some other movement, faith, or faction filled. This is not a counsel of despair; it is a correction of the picture. The dial moved, which the old framing said it could not; but it moved to a new setting, not to no setting, and the new setting has its own keepers and its own loaded texts. The second qualification is that the costs on the second dial are real and are paid by real people: the person who acts on having seen through the arrangement bears the exclusion, the punishment, the lost belonging, and bears it whether or not the seeing was correct. Seeing lowers no cost by itself. It only changes what a person knows they are paying for.

So the machine is durable because it tends to set both dials in its own favor and to keep them set across the generations, cheaply, through the ordinary transmission of values from parents and teachers and priests who believe what they pass on. It is not inescapable, because both dials can come loose — values can be re-formed, accountings can weaken — and when they do the arrangement bends or breaks. Durable, not fixed; a strong tendency, not a law. That distinction is the whole correction this section makes, and it is the distinction on which the next one depends.

IX. What Is Actually Possible

If seeing the machine does not by itself free anyone, and the machine cannot be wished away, and the floor beneath it leads only to mass death, the account can seem to close on despair. It does not, and the distinction that saves it is the one the collection most wants its reader to carry, because it is the difference between a useful truth and a paralyzing one.

The machine cannot be removed, but it can be built better or worse, and the difference between a better and a worse one is enormous in the lives of the people inside it. Every governing arrangement runs the same engine on the same kind of mind through the same kind of formation, so the question is never whether a people will be governed by a managed belief — the only alternative to a managed

belief is the warlord's vacuum, where the second dial returns to the sword and life is worse for almost everyone. The question is always *which* belief, managed *how*, setting the first dial toward what values, and leaving the many *how much* recourse when the dials are turned against them. An arrangement can be built so that the interpreter class is captured wholly by the apex, the loaded texts read only ever in the apex's favor, the population's self-policing turned entirely to the apex's protection, and the few left to take whatever they can. Or an arrangement can be built so that the loaded texts contain, in their universal language, real constraints on the few that the many can invoke; so that the interpreter class is divided and contestable rather than unified and owned; so that there are channels, real if partial, through which the governed can press the arrangement toward their own interest without tearing down the apparatus that feeds them. The arrangements of the modern liberal order, whatever else is true of them, tend to leave more such recourse than the arrangements that preceded them — which is not the same as freedom, and is very far from equality, but is also not nothing, and is the kind of thing worth defending and worth improving.

This is what the collection means by *institutional friction*: the deliberate construction and defense of arrangements that make the dials expensive to set from a single hand. Friction keeps the interpreter class contestable, so no one faction owns the reading of the sacred thing. It keeps the narrative channels plural, so the first dial cannot be set by a monopoly on the story. It keeps a measure of economic security in reach, so that the cost of deviation on the second dial does not rise to the point where no one can afford to dissent. It distributes authority, so that no single node can fill the benefit column and keep the account and pronounce the law all at once. None of these is sufficient, each is partial, and all of them require constant maintenance, because the tendency of the machine is always to re-concentrate the dials. But together they are the structural conditions under which setting the dials against the many is most costly and most contested — and, not incidentally, the conditions under which the rare person who has done the work of seeing through one setting can act on it, and survive, and perhaps move others.

This is the reformist rather than the revolutionary conclusion, and it is reached not from timidity but from the same analysis that produced everything above. The delusion is the romantic dream of tearing the machine down to free the people underneath, which kills the people the floor cannot release and rebuilds the machine from the vacuum, the next coalition setting the dials afresh. The surrender is the cynic's conclusion that, since the machine cannot be removed, all arrangements are equally a fraud and none worth defending, which simply hands the dials to whoever wants them most. Between the two is the only work that is neither delusion nor surrender: to know the machine exactly, to give up the hope of standing outside all formation, and to spend one's effort on the difference between its better and worse forms — which is the only difference that was ever actually available to be made.

X. The Whole in One View

Set the parts together and the machine stands complete. The engine is cost and benefit, run by every person from their own position — but it has two dials, and neither is set by nature. The first dial is what the person counts as a benefit, which is filled by the values their formation installed before they could weigh them; the second is whether a cost is real, which depends on whether anyone is actually keeping account. The floor — the metabolic trap — is why the person whose dials are being set cannot simply leave: the apparatus that feeds the modern world has grown the population past any number the unimproved land could hold, and the exit leads to death, not freedom. The lock — the ancient mind in the modern environment — is why the first dial can be set from outside at all, and why a symbol can stand in for an enforcer on the second. The build runs from the sword to the self-running machine: force sets the cost dial at the founding, a belief is attached and installed over generations until the benefit dial carries the load, and the enforcer withdraws to the margins because the formed now keep their own account and punish their own deviants for free. The priesthood keeps the values current and works the reframing that binds the rule on the many while loosening it for the few. And the whole of it can be seen in the single act of a crowd raising stones against a violator under a law that people wrote for their own position generations before — the few having spent nothing, the many enforcing the few's order with their own hands and their own conviction and their own sense of doing right.

That is how the few tend to govern the many: not mainly by force, which is too expensive and too brittle to hold anything for long, and not by a lie the many would reject if they saw it, but by setting, on the floor of a trap no one can leave and through the lock of a mind that can be reached, the two dials by which every person decides — filling the benefit column with values that make the arrangement feel like the person's own, and arranging the cost column so that deviation is punished, increasingly by the governed themselves. It is durable because it sets both dials in its own favor and reproduces that setting cheaply across the generations. It is not inescapable, because both dials can come loose — values can be re-formed, by study or by conversion or by the collapse of the story; accountings can weaken, when the enforcer fails or the interpreter class splits — and when they do, the arrangement bends or breaks, though what rushes into the vacuum is usually a new arrangement setting the dials anew rather than no arrangement at all. The machine cannot be escaped into a formation-free freedom, because there is nowhere outside formation to stand. It can only be built better or worse, and the whole of what is humanly available is the difference between the two. The collection exists to describe the machine exactly, in the conviction that a thing seen clearly can be built better than a thing not seen at all, and that the clear sight of how the few have always governed the many is the only foundation on which anyone might govern them a little less cruelly than before.

Principal Sources and Further Reading

On the State, Coercion, and the Metabolic Floor

Carneiro, Robert L. "A Theory of the Origin of the State." *Science* 169 (1970): 733–738. (See also the later "The Circumscription Theory: A Clarification, Amplification, and Reformulation," and the critical reassessments by H. J. M. Claessen's "early state" school and by Zinkina, Korotayev, and Andreev, for the exceptions that make circumscription a tendency rather than a law.)

Scott, James C. *Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

Smil, Vaclav. *Enriching the Earth: Fritz Haber, Carl Bosch, and the Transformation of World Food Production.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001. (For the population estimates and their disputed causation, see also Erisman et al., "How a Century of Ammonia Synthesis Changed the World," *Nature Geoscience* 1 (2008): 636–639.)

Catton, William R. *Overshoot: The Ecological Basis of Revolutionary Change.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980.

On the Cognitive Architecture and Its Exploitation

Tetlock, Philip E. "Thinking the Unthinkable: Sacred Values and Taboo Cognitions." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7, no. 7 (2003): 320–324.

Tetlock, Philip E., et al. "The Psychology of the Unthinkable: Taboo Trade-offs, Forbidden Base Rates, and Heretical Counterfactuals." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 78, no. 5 (2000): 853–870.

Atran, Scott. *Talking to the Enemy: Faith, Brotherhood, and the (Un)Making of Terrorists.* New York: Ecco, 2010.

Kahneman, Daniel. *Thinking, Fast and Slow.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011. (The fast/slow model is a useful frame under continuing scholarly debate; the argument here relies only on its uncontested core.)

Giphart, Ronald, and Mark van Vugt. *Mismatch: How Our Stone Age Brain Deceives Us Every Day.* London: Robinson, 2018.

Companion Papers in This Collection

Bryan, Thomas J. *The Exploit: Human Cognitive Architecture and the Permanent Vulnerability to Elite Capture.* Patterns of Power, 2026. (The five cognitive components in full.)

Bryan, Thomas J. *The Engine and the Two Dials.* Patterns of Power, 2026. (The decision model stated on its own.)

Bryan, Thomas J. *The Shut Door.* Patterns of Power, 2026. (The metabolic trap in full.)

Bryan, Thomas J. *The Thing That Makes the Throne Worth Taking.* Patterns of Power, 2026. (Belief as the power source; warlordism as the control case.)

Bryan, Thomas J. *Position Logic.* Patterns of Power, 2026. (Why hierarchies defend themselves without instruction.)

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Part of the collection Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations.

Research and composition by Claude (Anthropic).